

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION
No. 7:19-CV-208-D

CATHY ARRINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW SAUL,
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

ORDER

On July 7, 2020, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 28] and recommended that the court grant plaintiff’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 19], deny defendant’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 23], and remand the action to the Commissioner. Neither party objected to the M&R. Cf. [D.E. 28].

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (emphasis, alteration, and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and the briefs. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. Accordingly, the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 28].

In sum, the court GRANTS plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 19], DENIES defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 23], and REMANDS the action to the Commissioner.

SO ORDERED. This 3 day of August 2020.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge